

**PIASETZKI & NENNIGER**  
BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS • PATENT & TRADEMARK AGENTS

120 Adelaide Street West, Suite 2308  
Toronto, Ontario Canada M5H 1T1  
Telephone (416) 955-0050  
Facsimile (416) 955-0053

Gregory A. Piasetzki, Hons. B.Sc. (Chem.), LL.B.\*  
James T. Nenniger, Hons.B.Sc. (Civil Eng.), LL.B.  
Avi Zimmerman, Hons.B.A.Sc. (Elec. Eng.), LL.B.  
Stephen P. Shoshan, Hons.B.A.Sc. (Sys.Des.), LL.B.

David F. Fernandes, B.A.Sc. (Eng. Sci.), LL.B.  
John Bujan, B.Sc. (Chem.), LL.B.

*\*Certified by the Law Society of Upper Canada as a Specialist in  
Intellectual Property Law (Patents, Trademarks & Copyrights)*

Applicant: **Saksun, John, Sr.**  
Serial No.: **09/427,986**  
Filed: **October 27, 1999**  
For: **GOLF CLUB HEAD AND METHOD  
OF MAKING THE SAME**  
Examiner: **E. Lee**  
Group Art Unit: **1732**  
Docket: **SAK007/JTN**  
Date: **April 3, 2003**

#1240  
P.L.H.  
4-2003

04/08/2003 NHENSLEY 00000004 09427986

01 FC:2252

465.00 OP

**RESPONSE**

United States Patent and Trademark Office  
The Commissioner of Patents  
2900 Crystal Drive  
Arlington, Virginia  
U.S.A. 22202-3513

Dear Sirs:

This is in response to the Office Action dated 10/04/02, to which a response is due to be filed on or before January 4, 2003. A three month extension of time accompanies this response, which is therefore submitted as being timely.

Claims 27 to 34, drawn to a method of molding a golf club head, classified in class 29, subclass 527.1 are the subject of this examination. In the non-final office action the Examiner rejected the claims, and as a result the applicant has made modifications to the claims. Two claim sets are enclosed, one showing the changes made and the other being a clean copy. The old numbering has been retained.

The claims now present the step of positioning a tubular anchoring element in the mould having a smooth shaft receiving internal bore and a roughened outside surface to permit molded material to infill and secure the anchoring element in place when hardened.

RECEIVED  
APR - 4 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Support for these amendments may be found in the description at page 11, lines 1 to 6 and page 10, lines 21 to 31. As the amendments do not add any new matter, it is respectfully submitted that they are proper and should be entered.

In addition claim 31 has been amended to overcome the indefinite rejection, in that it no longer refers to an insert "receiving" pocket, as this term has been removed from the claim in both the second and third lines. As well claim 34 has been made dependent on claim 33 to provide an antecedent for the term "said attachment screw".

The present invention is directed to a method of forming a moulded golf club head. A moulded golf club head has a number of advantages as noted in the disclosure, including, an optimized distribution of weight in the volume of the head, to improve striking characteristics, a more consistent quality of product as compared to natural products such as wood, and a reduced cost of manufacturing due to ease of production and lower costs of materials. Thus, a moulded club head is highly desirable and as is evident from the art of record, a moulded club head has been long sought.

To date, a reliable moulded club head has not been successfully commercialized, believed in part due to the difficulty of reliably attaching a shaft to a moulded club head. The method of forming a golf club head according to the present invention as now claimed is directed to overcoming this attachment problem.

In the office action the examiner rejected claims 27 - 34 as being unpatentable over Bradley, in view of Burr. In the examiner's view, Bradley teaches all of the applicant's steps except for forming a front face on the main body. Burr teaches molding an insert front face into a golf club head and according to the examiner, Bradley and Burr are combinable because they are analogous with respect to molding golf clubs. Thus, in the examiner's view, it would be obvious to form the front face in the club head of Bradley to increase distance. The applicant respectfully traverses the examiners rejection, and in any

event has entered certain claim amendments to further clarify the applicant's invention as explained below.

The applicant respectfully submits that the examiner's notional combination of Bradley and Burr is improper, as to do so would clearly contradict the plain teachings of the references. More particularly, Bradley teaches a metal insert 14 which has, among other features, an integral striking face plate 22, for making contact with the ball. To suggest that Burr can be combined with Bradley requires ignoring the clear teaching of a metal striking face plate on a plastic molded head to improve distance. In the applicant's respectful submission there is no basis in either Burr or Bradley for making the combination. Thus, it appears that the only justification for the notional combination is the applicant's own specification which is not a proper basis for making the alleged combination. More specifically, there is no motivation for replacing the metal striking face of Bradley with the molded insert of Burr, because these two are incompatible structures. Bradley teaches an integral insert 14, to hold the face plate, bracing, sole plate, weight bore and hosel elements together. It is not clear how the face plate could be removed, which is still maintaining an integral insert 14.

Further, the applicant has now amended the claims to more clearly distinguish over the art. The essence of the applicant's invention is to be able to position as much of the weight of the club head in as favourable a position as possible. The more weight in the weights, therefore the better. Bradley teaches an integral insert 14 having a weight receiving bore, a sole plate, an impact face and a hosel 20. The hosel is secured in place by means of being integrally attached to the other elements of the insert. Braces 30 and 32 are also provided to further attach the insert elements together.

In contrast, the applicant's invention teaches using a separate tubular anchoring element to provide a secure attachment to the shaft. Indeed, in the applicant's method two separate steps are claimed, one for positioning the weights in a mold and a second for

positioning the anchoring element in the mold, clearly indicating that the weights are not integral with the anchoring element. The anchoring element and the molded head are the only parts of the head apart from the weight; there are no metal braces, sole plate, striking face plate or the like. Thus, a larger percentage of the overall club head weight can be located in the weights and positioned to optimize the desired club head weighting.

Not from

The applicant is the first to realize that a secure attachment can be made between the shaft and a plastic club head by using a tubular metal anchoring element without an integral insert having all the features of insert 14. Secure attachment is achieved by positioning the anchoring element having a smooth internal bore for forming a good bond with the club shaft and a roughened exterior surface to permit a secure attachment of the anchoring element in the plastic club head as the club head is molded around the anchoring element. By securing the element in this way a higher percent of the overall club weight can be advantageously positioned by means of the weights. Nothing in any combination of Burr and Bradley teaches such a roughened outer surface, nor forming a bond between such outside surface and the resin as claimed in step (d) of claim 1.


The applicant is the first to teach the steps as claimed which result in a secure club head attachment to a shaft for a moulded club head. Thus, it is submitted that the claims as amended patentably define over the art.

In summary it is respectfully submitted that none of Bradley, Burr, nor any of the other art, whether taken singly or in combination, anticipate or render the applicant's invention as now claimed obvious. Reconsideration is respectfully requested and an early allowance earnestly solicited.

Thus, amended claim 27 is now believed to be patentable over the art of record. Those remaining claims dependent from claim 27 are also submitted as being patentable.

If the examiner has any questions or further comments, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned directly at (416) 955-0050.

Respectfully submitted,  
**PIASETZKI & NENNIGER**



James T. Nenniger  
Registration No. 32,670

JTN/jw

Encl.

sak007-response 003.wpd